

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, March 15, 1991

- Present: C.L. Bertrand; M. Yates; B. Harris; P. Albert; S. Ruby; C. White; T. Swift; J. Appleby; P. Widden; M. Brian; Z. Hamlet; E. Preston; G. Kanaan; B. Lewis; D. Shapiro; G. Auchinachie; C. Lévy; R. Kilgour; M. Barlow; G. Sassano; G. Decarie; R. Perigoe; J. Locke; M. Shames; W. Byers; A. Teffeteller; C. Gray; R. Sharma; M. Poirier; N. Segalowitz; M. Oppenheim; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; G. Newsham; J. Snyder; K. Clément; B. Leonhardt.
- Regrets: F. Stevens; W. Knitter; M. Armstrong; H. Shulman; M. Taylor; C. Potworowski; S. Lanthier-O'Connor.
- Absent: J. Lightstone; M. Szabo; J. Gavin; G. Fisher; H. McQueen; G. Bastien; E. Budik; L. Cohen; H. Danakas; J. Drolet; S. Farber; R. Gotlieb; G. Grougrou; J. Gruman; E. Kalantar; P. Richards; J. Serruya; T. Taylor.

Documents Distributed and Considered at this meeting:

- ASFC 91-3M-A Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees
- ASFC 91-1M-B Discussion of Graduate Review Document

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Dr. Decarie requested that Item 9 be changed to "Discussion of the document *Developing a Strategic Space Plan*" and that Item 10 be "Next Meeting" and Item 11 be "Adjournment".

Council voted on the change of Agenda.

Carried.

- 90-3-1 **It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Poirier) that the Agenda be approved as changed.**

Carried.

3. Approval of Minutes

- 90-3-2 **It was moved and seconded (Hamlet/Levy) that the minutes be accepted.**

The following corrections were requested:

Dr. Widden - that on Page 15, the sentence dealing with non-salary budget should read - "the non-salary budget for the department was only about 10% of that figure".

Dr. Shames pointed out:

p. 4. last line should be corrected to read "and the appropriate people to make use of the information"

p. 14 line 7, delete the word "was"

p.20 line 19, delete "on occasion"

p. 21 line 12, insert after the word "longer" after ...programs will no".

Dr. Decarie apologized for his statement regarding the Director of Women's Studies on page 4. He had not meant to say Director of Women's Studies but Advisor to the Rector on the Status of Women, and "scientific" should have been "unscientific". Dr. Decarie apologized to Professor Hamalian and Council and asked that the minutes should reflect this correction.

4. Remarks from the Chair

Dr. Bertrand called Council's attention to the fact that the Registrar had extended a call for nominations for Non-Academic Awards for the June 1991 Convocation: **The Malone Medal** (awarded to the graduating student who has made the most outstanding contribution to the **internal** university community through commitments (a) to improve the quality of student life (b) to pursue a cause and achieve a goal which brings distinction to the university); **The O'Brien Medal** (awarded to the graduating student whose efforts and dedication best exemplify the values of the university within the larger **external** community); **The First Graduate Class Award** (presented on behalf of the first graduate class of the Faculty of Arts, Science and Commerce of Sir George Williams College, known as the Guinea Pig Club, for the most innovative and new contribution either academic or extra-curricular to university life); and **The Concordia Medal**

(presented by the Alumni Association to a graduating student who has displayed distinctive leadership ability through both academic and non-academic achievements and has won the outstanding commendation of his/her fellows and of the faculty).

All nominations for the above awards should be submitted to the Registrar by May 1, 1991.

Dr. Bertrand said that last year at the March meeting of Arts and Science Faculty Council he wished the Stinger Basketball Team good luck in the National Finals and the team won. This year the team was again on its way to Halifax for the National Finals and the Dean wished them a repeat performance and a second championship.

Dr. Bertrand said that due to the letters generated by publication of the document *Developing a Strategic Space Plan*, Steering Committee had decided to call a special meeting to discuss the academic implications of the space plan for the Faculty of Arts and Science. Council could discuss the plan and decide how it fitted in with the planning of the Faculty of Arts and Science. Steering Committee also felt that it would be better to meet and discuss the document a month after publication of the report and after the two public forums were held.

5. Questions and Announcements

Dr. Gray asked if the Strategic Space Plan Committee was in recess.

Dr. Bertrand replied that he believed the Committee would continue their work until the end of May or June. He believed the committee would encourage submissions until May 20th, at which point the committee was to present a plan to the Vice Rector, Services and to the Office of the Rector.

6. Election/Ratification - Arts and Science Faculty Committees

Advisory Search Committees for the Appointment of Department Chairperson

Department of Applied Social Science
Department of Biology
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Département des Études françaises

Dr. D. White (PSYC)
Prof. M. Baldwin (CHEM)
Dr. E. Maly (BIOL)
Dr. M. Poirier (POLI)

Department of Geography
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Department of Religion
T.E.S.L. Centre

Dr. G. LeCavalier (SOCI)
Dr. C. Kalman (PHYS)
Dr. G. Dewey (SOCI)
Dr. L. Baron (EDUC)

Ratified

Advisory Search Committees for the Appointment of Principal/Director

Liberal Arts College
Science College
School for Community and Public Affairs
Simone de Beauvoir Institute

Dr. M. Bross (PSYC)
Dr. J. Stewart (PSYC)
Dr. G. Carr (HIST)
Dr. P. Thornton (GEOG)

Ratified

7. Follow-up Discussion of Graduate Review Document

Dr. Widden raised a concern of the Biology Department in that the department understood the the Board of Graduate Studies had decided the S.I.P. program would only be used for interdisciplinary studies. Dr. Widden wanted Council to recommend to the Board of Graduate Studies that they reconsider that decision.

Dr. Bertrand said that his recollection of the motion at the Board of Graduate Studies was that effective June 1, 1991, no one should be admitted to the S.I.P. program unless the studies were interdisciplinary in nature. It called for an end to using the S.I.P. program for graduate degrees in a single discipline. Dr. Bertrand reminded Council that the document under discussion simply called for the S.I.P. program and the Ph.D. in Humanities program to be housed under the Dean of Graduate Studies. The issue that concerned Biology was not in the document under discussion.

Dr. Byers said that the Graduate Review Committee had decided not to deal with the S.I.P. program in its report as it was itself undergoing appraisal within the Division of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Albert reported that the S.I.P. program was undergoing the appraisal process with an external examiner. One of the items coming out of that was that new policies should be developed regarding this program.

Dr. Widden said that he would like a strong statement of concern from Council over the decision of the Board of Graduate Studies as this could be devastating

to the research and graduate programs in Biology.

Dr. Oppenheim stated that the decision regarding the S.I.P. program was not made with the intention of punishing departments without a Ph.D. or graduate program but to encourage interdisciplinary studies.

Dr. Bertrand said that the program was being restructured and was not part of the document presently under discussion. In order to have a discussion on this topic, Dr. Bertrand suggested that Dr. Widden should notify Steering Committee of Biology's concerns to be considered for discussion at the next meeting of Council.

Dr. Widden responded that he would do so.

There being no further discussion on the Graduate Studies Review Document, Dr. Bertrand took that to mean that Council was happy with the motions that had been passed and proceeded with the agenda.

8. Other Business

Dr. Newsham mentioned that she had received notification of *The Image Campaign* which had been distributed throughout the university from the University Advancement Office. The pamphlets dealt with advertising Concordia University across Canada. Dr. Newsham stated that the T.E.S.L. Centre receive far more applications each year than the number of vacant places and had been asked to cut their intake by 50%. She questioned the wisdom of trying to attract out-of-province students when there was already a shortage of space at Concordia.

Dr. Bertrand responded that the Vice Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance would never accept the fact that we have too many students. To the Vice Rector, Institutional Relations and Finance each student represented so many dollars. He noted that as far as the T.E.S.L. Centre's problem was concerned they were recently granted a special limited term appointment to help ease the student overflow in the program. As far as advertising campaigns were concerned, he noted that it was also apparent that the demographers were partly correct in that numbers of students in the 18-24 age group were shrinking and we must try to continue to attract students.

9. **Strategic Space Plan**

Dr. Bertrand moved on to the discussion of the Strategic Space Plan.

Dr. Decarie wished to address the process by which the Committee was appointed and the process by which it carried out its mandate. He had very serious concerns about the lack of consultation in the way the committee was formed and the way the committee carried out its work in secret. He pointed out that there were no students or part-time faculty on the committee. It seemed to him that the Arts and Science Faculty Council should go on record to state that all committees in the university be properly constituted and properly consultative in carrying out their work. He would be willing to bring forward a motion to that effect.

Dr. Bertrand cautioned Council members to think carefully about whether they wished to limit the right of Vice-Rectors to strike Committees which they deemed necessary. He noted that Vice Rectors, Deans and Department Chairs had every right to set up whatever committees they wished and Council could not limit the right of any of these people to do that. He urged members to think very carefully before making any motion that would limit that right.

Dr. Decarie said that he was puzzled that we were given a report which was going to carry a great deal of weight without consultation and with insufficient time to formulate a reasoned response.

90-3-3

It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Leonhardt) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council request that the Rector immediately appoint a new space planning committee after due consultation with the representative bodies of the university, and establish guidelines and procedures guaranteeing the full participation of all units of the university and all academic bodies in any future space planning.

Dr. Bertrand said that Steering Committee did not want to have this item on the agenda today at all. However, any insistence that the committee and its work be withdrawn would be an insult to the five faculty members who had worked on the report. This would not do anybody any good at all. A special meeting of Arts and Science Faculty Council was set for April 18th at 2:00 p.m. Any motions on the issue should be submitted to Steering Committee for that meeting by April 8th. Dr. Bertrand also pointed out that the present motion was out of order because there had been no notice of motion prior to the meeting.

Dr. Decarie challenged the ruling.

16 for the Chair; 8 for the motion; Defeated

Dr. Bertrand repeated that there would be a special meeting of Arts and Science Faculty Council on April 18 at 2:00 p.m. in Room DL-200 when the only item on the agenda would be the *Strategic Space Plan*.

Professor Perigoe asked if members of the Strategic Space Planning Committee would be present at Faculty Council.

Dr. Bertrand replied that the academic issues which would concern Arts and Science could be discussed without the presence of the members of the space committee. The Committee had already scheduled two public meetings to answer questions, however, Steering Committee would discuss this request and may decide to invite members of the committee to the meeting of Council.

Dr. Byers asked if the meeting in April would still allow time for submissions to be forwarded to the Committee before their deadline.

Dr. Bertrand responded that it would.

Dr. Newsham asked if Dr. Bertrand had said only the principles would be discussed or the contents of the report.

Dr. Bertrand responded that Steering Committee had decided that the discussion of the April meeting would be restricted to the Principles and the academic implications that come directly out of those principles. This was Steering Committee's decision. The issue of which department would move to which location would not be discussed.

Dr. Shames said that there were some academic concerns that could include the location of departments.

Dr. Oppenheim understood that consultation might not always be necessary but he was bothered by the feeling that some people in positions of authority did not think that faculty members could discuss things without being emotional and come forward with suggestions in a constructive way. The concern about where a department might be located was very real and although on the surface it did not appear to be an academic matter, it could be in some cases. He hoped for a constructive discussion in order to understand what it all meant. Council members might not all approve the plan but at least representatives of the department could have input.

Dr. Bertrand said that from his perspective there were two major problems: location was not an academic matter and Council members might not have the proper information to discuss much more than the principles of the document. That could be remedied with experience and study. There were space norms

from the government, past experience with departments that have consolidated - what it means to a budget and many other factors to be considered. Most members of Council have not had to deal with these issues. The principles can be discussed and what they mean to the Faculty of Arts and Science. Council members will have another month to think about the principles and to formulate ideas about them that were not just a reactions to the document. Council could then have a more fruitful and meaningful discussion.

Dr. Barlow said that it would be helpful to discuss procedures for selecting people to be put on committees.

Dr. Teffeteller asked if the question of rent was part of the reason for consolidation and wished to know who pays the rent for university rented property and where did that money come from.

Dr. Bertrand said that he did not notice that the report said that the rents were too expensive downtown and therefore departments had to move to Loyola. The issue was that we were in a situation where we have very expensive laboratories and very expensive facilities housed in rented space. Now that the second phase of the library project was underway, there was an opportunity to put those kinds of facilities in owned space and to reduce the overall cost of rental property. The campus issue was irrelevant to that. The Quebec government gave universities a grant for rented space. The problem was that over the years the formula used by the government equalized across the province. So, if space was rented in Chicoutimi or downtown Montreal, the same amount of money per square meter was received from the government. It cost the university more than it should have because we had to use some of the operating budget for rental, over and above the money that the government gave us for rental. There was therefore an added incentive to get out of rented space.

Dr. Teffeteller thought that the government gave a designated amount to cover rental but that it was only 80%.

Dr. Bertrand said that he did not know the figure but that 100% would be necessary.

Dr. Byers said that Steering Committee would hope to have some input from departments to look at before the meeting in April. Council members should go back to their departments and discuss this issue and provide Steering Committee with documentation on their concerns. This could mean examining the process. One major issue was that Science and Technology will be based mainly downtown and Social Science and the Humanities will be based at Loyola. This was an academic question and we have to address it now in some way.

Dr. Shames wished to know how long the committee responsible for the development of the space plan had been sitting.

Dr. Bertrand responded that he believed it was formed in September 1990.

Professor Brian asked that Steering Committee give some thought to asking the Chair of the space committee to attend the April meeting - not to lead the discussion but in order to aid the discussion. She felt strongly that there should be a replacement of some of the principles as well as the addition of some other principles.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale said we should focus here on a plan for Arts and Science in order to create together a direction for the Faculty of Arts and Science. That would require that we cease and desist from worrying about the committee and be concerned about where this plan could go and how it will affect the Arts and Science Faculty.

Dr. Auchinachie questioned whether members of Council would be able to grasp the educational implications of the space plan since the dean felt that they could not understand the document.

Dr. Bertrand responded that what he had said was that (although Council members were the most intelligent people in the university), they may not have the experience or all of the information necessary to make informed judgements about the space plan.

Dr. Decarie stated that earlier the Dean had said that Administrators must have the power to appoint whomever they wished to whatever committee they wished to strike. Here was a concrete case where the report was in fact a matter of policy and Council members were left to tinker as best they could, despite their ignorance, and at the last minute, to try to find some way to fit this into an educational framework. This struck him as a formula for disaster which was the reason that at some point the process should be examined.

Dr. Bertrand said that he felt that Council was asking for trouble if it tried to legislate against the right of a Vice Rector, a Dean or a Chair to set up an advisory committee to study a problem, whatever that problem might be. Dr. Byers had already indicated that Steering Committee would be willing to listen to requests that the process be discussed and perhaps the substantive issues should be discussed first and then go back to the process later if Council wished.

Professor Brian asked if the meeting of April 18th, would be at 2:00 p.m.

Dr. Bertrand responded that it would be at 2:00 p.m.

Dr. Auchinachie asked if we could extrapolate from this report that bringing departments together would effect collegiality. If there was a problem with collegiality surely that problem should be discussed.

Dr. Bertrand said that we would see how the debate unfolded.

Dr. Widden asked if there would be copies of the document circulated to Council as he never reads *Concordia's Thursday Report*.

Dr. Bertrand said that he did not have copies but he was sure that there were copies around and the Dean's Office would not pay for copying the report when there were so many extra copies of *Concordia's Thursday Report already printed*.

10. Date and Time of Next Meeting

Dr. Bertrand again reminded Council that a special meeting would be held April 18, 1991 at 2:00 p.m. in DL-200 to discuss the space document.

11. Adjournment

90-3-4 It was moved and seconded (Oppenheim/Barlow) that the meeting be adjourned at 4:15 p.m.